

REMARKS

The Abstract has been amended in order to improve its form and to delete therefrom the objectionable term "Fig. 1".

The specification has been amended in order to improve its form and to provide the customary headings such as --Background of the Invention-- etc.

Claims 1-6 were amended in order to delete therefrom the reference labels and to otherwise improve their form, but without materially altering the scope thereof, wherefore these amendments will not require further consideration and/or search by the Patent and Trademark Office.

Claim 7-17 were added in order to provide applicants with protection commensurate in scope with the invention disclosed.

Claims 1-3, 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamamoto (USP 5,515,074).

In the Yamamoto apparatus, display density of an LCD display screen is controlled "according to one of the updated density data stored in the main memory and the density data stored in the data memory corresponding to the environmental temperature detected by the temperature sensor" (see column 2, lines 21-25 of Yamamoto; also see last paragraph of claim 2 in column 6).

In contrast, claim 1 calls for a driver circuit operative to adjust the adjustable characteristic based on the base setting and the correction factor. That is, in Yamamoto the control is an

either/or factor, whereas in claim 1 the control is based on both the stored basic setting and the stored correction factor. Claim 1 is clearly not anticipated by the density control device described in the Yamamoto patent.

As to dependent claim 5, the Office Action presents no factual evidence to show that the stored correction factor "is based on an individual property of the display device". Claim 5, as a matter of law, is not anticipated by Yamamoto because, inter alia, the Office Action presents no factual support for the "102" rejection thereof and therefore does not set out a prima facie case of anticipation for this claim.

The Office Action is also defective in that the Patent and Trademark Office relies on element 14 (main memory) as the claimed means for storing a basic setting and as the means for storing (and accessing) a correction factor. It is a long established rule of Patent and Trademark Office prosecution practice that the Patent and Trademark Office may not use a single element of a reference in order to meet two or more claimed elements in an applicant's claim.

Claim 6 is not anticipated by Yamamoto because, inter alia, this reference does not disclose the novel claimed feature of determining a correction factor to the basic setting based on the actual characteristic of the display device and the characteristics of the driver circuit when the basic setting is used. The only factual support presented in the Office Action for the "102"

rejection of this feature of claim 6 is column 4, lines 61-68 and column 5, lines 1-5 of Yamamoto. But the subject matter in Yamamoto cited by the Patent and Trademark Office to provide factual support for this feature of claim 6 deals instead with manual control of the apparatus, temperature follow-up control, and further operations if power is off. All of this is irrelevant to the aforesaid novel feature of claim 6, wherefore the Office Action does not set forth a prima facie case of anticipation as to this claim in view of the absence of any factual support therefor in the Office Action.

If the Patent and Trademark Office persists in its "102" rejection of claims 1-3, 5 and 6, then the next Office Action should specifically cite those portions of any applied reference that allegedly disclose the features discussed above.

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto in view of Inoue (USP 5,517,212).

Since Inoue does not cure any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to Yamamoto, therefore any combination of Inoue with Yamamoto, even if obvious (which it is not), still would not result in the novel and useful apparatus of claim 4. Furthermore, the adjustment voltage in Inoue has nothing to do with a correction factor for correcting a basic setting of an adjustable characteristic of a driver circuit (for a display device) and therefore there is no apparent motivation disclosed to suggest such a modification of the Yamamoto apparatus. As to the alleged factual

support in Inoue to modify the Yamamoto apparatus, i.e. column 2, lines 19-20, this subject matter deals with manual control of the contrast adjustment circuit of an LCD panel, whereas an important object of this application is to eliminate the requirement for a manual contrast control in a display device.

It would not be obvious to combine Inoue with Yamamoto in a manner that would result in the novel driver circuit as claimed in claim 4 of this application. The Office Action does not present the factual support requisite for a valid prima facie case of obviousness as to claim 4.

Claims 7-17 are patentable for the general reasons advanced above as well as for other novel features recited therein. For example, claim 7 clearly recites the novel step of adjusting the driver circuit based upon both the stored basic setting and the stored correction factor. Claim 17 includes a similar feature.

Claim 8 calls for the further step of determining the ambient temperature etc. so that the driver circuit is adjusted according to three parameters, including ambient temperature. Claim 9 recites a similar feature with respect to the driver circuit.

Claim 10 also clearly recites the main novel feature of this application. The calibration operation of claim 11 for deriving the correction factor is novel and patentable.

Claim 12 specifies further novel details with respect to the basic setting. Claim 13 specifically recites that the claimed

apparatus is without adjustment of the contrast etc.

Claim 14 makes it clear that the stored basic setting and the stored correction factor are independent of temperature, whereas in Yamamoto temperature dependence is an important factor. Claim 15 is also directed to such temperature independence.

Claim 16 is a method claim including novel subject matter similar to apparatus claim 11 and so it is also novel and patentable.

In view of the incomplete nature of the Office Action, as noted above, the next Office Action in this application should not be made final.

Please charge the cost of any additional fees in connection with the above amendment to Deposit Account No. 14-1270.

Reexamination and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By Bernard Franzblau
Bernard Franzblau, Reg. 20,346
Patent Consultant
(914) 333-9614

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

It is hereby certified that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to:

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

On 3/13/03

By Bernard Franzblau